may not have been adequate substitutes available. Therefore, loss of incoj to the farming industry from banning these pesticides can run into tens millions of dollars per county.

The conventional wisdom, that virtually any investment in ground wa~ protection is preferable to bearing the cost of later contamination, may g* erally reflect valid intuition regarding present conditions. However, it d(not and cannot, given available methods and data, reflect comprehensi analysis of relative costs and benefits.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Effective ground water protection programs have significant costs asso ated with them that can, in some cases, exceed the value of the resource the costs of remedial actions. While analytical techniques are evolving rz idly and data bases are growing, significant application difficulties rema: These difficulties will not be removed until serious attempts are made perform economic analyses of ground water protection programs and str; egies. Meanwhile, social, political, and economic conditions continue evolve, shifting costs and values so that it is likely to become more and me difficult to strike the right balance between prevention and remedy, or I tween universal policies and problem-specific measures.

The committee believes that economic analysis is one of the useful ways p] grams and strategies can be judged. Economic analyses should be conducted existing and proposed ground water protection measures so that experience c be gained with techniques and data requirements, and decision-makers can 1 come familiar with the results of such analyses. Such analyses have been p< formed in connection with hazardous waste cleanup activities (assessment Superfund natural resource damages, for example) and may be useful in eval ating ground water protection programs.